DEBATE IN THE SENATE:

REMOVALS AND APPOINTMENT'S.

TUESDAY, APRIL 23, 1850.

The Senate having under consideration the resolution offered some time since by Mr. BRADBURY, calling on the Executive for information in relation to removals from and

Mr. BELL. I had intended, Mr. President, to discuss the general principles involved in the resolution offered by the Senator from Maine at some length; but, at present, I shall detain the Senate only a very short time. I do not wish to

regulate the whole subject by law, and that if it is not thus regulated; if we fail to do something on this subject, that it will, in the end, undo the Government. It is in great part, sir, the root and foundation of all those dissensions growing out of the subject of slavery that have of late distracted the country, and which has paralyzed the legislative powers of Congress for the last four or five months. This doctrine of absolutism in removals from office, I regard as the main source not only of existing difficulties and disturbances in the regular operation of this branch of the Government, but that it will become the cause of continued dissensions and still more sastrous results to the whole country, unless an adequate remedy shall be applied.

Sir, I shall not, in speaking upon this subject, consider it as

unworthy or unbecoming in me to give my serious attention to the gross charges of inconsistency, of broken pledges made against the present Administration in the exercise of the appointing power. Though an humble individual, sir, I take unto mypower. Though an humble individual, sir, I take the self my full share of the responsibility of bringing General Taylor into power. I do not claim having exerted any this point, but such as I possessed I emgreat influence upon this point, but such as I possessed I em-ployed. I am ready now, and shall be at all times ready, to acknowledge my agency, and to assume my full share of responsibility for whatever injury to the country, or to any sound principle, which may follow; and if General Taylor has violated the numerous pledges which it is said he has given, and which have been referred to by the Senator from Maine in the gross and atrocious manner asserted by that Sein the gross and atrocious manner asserted by that Senator, I desire it to be shown, that I also may join in that condemnation which he is now receiving. But until I see something further disclosed than I have yet seen, something better founded than the arguments and conclusions of the Senator from Maine to sustain the position taken by that Senator, I do not anticipate that, in regard to that subject, or any other that has been brought under my notice, I shall repent my instrumentality, humble as it may have been, in the elevation of General Taylor to the Presidential chair. I can readily concede a degree of plausibility to the senator the common apprehension in the argument of the Senator from Maine, and in the tens of thousands of newspaper paragraphs which have been circulated throughout the country, in reference to these alleged violations of pledges, but when you come to analyze these pledges, and give to them their just in particular cases of removal, to which my attention had been making nearly all, Republican or Democratic. The old party lines the Senator the Senator the Senator the Senator the Senator the natural party all, Republican or Democratic. The old party lines nearly all, Republican or Democratic. The old party lines the Senator the S and fair import and construction, and then to investigate the actual grounds and principles upon which the President has ceeded in the exercise of the appointing power, I venture assertion that there will be found to be no inconsistency.

The Senator from Maine, sir, to-day, very unexpectedly to me, has made a very elaborate effort in reply to the speech of the Senator from Connecticut; and, sir, what are the charges which have been urged with so much pertinacity, and repeated over and ever again with reference to the pledges of General Taylor?

It is asserted that General Taylor, before his election, declared his decided opposition, in numerous letters, to the practice of proscription for opinion's sake—a practice, which I may add, the Senator might justly have assented to be sanctioned by the established doctrine of the party to which he belongs. For, sir, it is well known that the doctrine of appointing power vested in him by the constitution, may thrust out every subordinate officer of the Government, except the judicial functionaries, at his discretion, without any pretext of official delinquency, misbehavior, or the want of official qualification; and I need not stop to show that the practice of the Democratic party when in power, during the last twenty years, has been in conformity with this creed.

is the doctrine advanced, and that is the practice on one side. The charge against General Taylor is, that he pledged himself to the country, to set his face against this practice; that he solemnly avowed his opposition to the pre-scriptive policy, and that he has gressly violated these pledges, and, by his conduct since he came into power, has wholly disregarded his former professions. I undertake to say that General Taylor avows the same doctrines now that he has always avowed upon this point. What is the proof that General Taylor has violated his pledges? Why, sir, it is that he has made a greater number of removals in the short pe-ticd that has elapsed since he came into power, than were Buren's administrations. This fact is the main reliance of the Senator from Maine in proving that General Taylor has in his practice contradicted his professions on this subject, and lent himself to the policy of proscription for epinion's sake. A few words, as to the force of this fact, that General Taylor has removed a greater number of officers in his time than General Jackson and Mr. Van Buren re-moved in the whole period of their power. That depends upon the principles upon which the removals were made. What are the principles upon which removals have been made by General Taylor. Have they been made for mere made by General Taylor. Have they been made for mere opinions' sake—simply in the exercise of an absolute arbitrary power? No, sir; I understand they have only been made upon principles, and for causes that, in our past history, have been admitted to be sound and republican; and in accordance with the practice of Jefferson—and Jefferson was as strongly opposed to the policy of removal for opinion's sake, as General Taylor himself. But the Senator inquires what are the causes of these removals? Sir, it cannot be expected. are the causes of these removals? Sir, it cannot be expected that I can vouch for the fact that in every case of removal there have been different causes existing from that of a mere difference of political opinion; but I can speak of my own knowledge of the subject, so far as it goes.

I have learned, upon inquiry from the proper source, that the Administration proceeds, in making removals, upon the principle, that worthy and competent incumbents ought not to be removed, merely on the ground that they differ from the Administration in their political opinions, but that some other

The gentleman from Maine has referred to the State of Tennessee and removals there as proof of the charge which he makes against Gen. Taylor. Sir, I know of no individual case in the State of Tennessee of removal, in which a special cause other than a difference of political sentiment was not required to be pointed out and sufficiently proved before a removal was made. It is true that a few office-holders have been displaced in that State, and several other changes have been made, upon resignations and the expiration of the commissions of former incumbents, but in every case of removal, special cause of objection was shown. I know of no case in which the removal has not been based in my judgment upon sound demo-cratic republican principles, such as I have always considered as safe and proper, and no man has heretofore been more decidedly opposed to the prescriptive policy than myself.

Active interference in elections has been, I am advised, the general and most usual ground of the removals made by this Administration. The perfect right of office-holders to hold what political opinions they please is not denied, and to express them in social interceurse, and to vote accordingly at the polls, is not denied, or imputed as a fault : but ac ive participation-intermeddling in elections : taking part at publie meetings, making par'y speeches, and drumming up votes at the polls, are considered inconsistent with the regular, faithful and satisfactory discharge of efficial duties, and held, and justly so, in my opinion, to be good cause for dismissal, to say nothing of the effect of such conduct upon the purity of the elective franchise. Sir, I repeat that I remember no case in my own State in which an office-holder has been re-

moved for any other than sufficient causes. But, sir, I do remember that great fault has been found in that State by many members of the party with which I have been associated so long, that more removals have not taken place: and when the explanation has been made that General Taylor will not remove without some special cause, other than a difference in political sentiment, and that the Democrats in office will not be displaced as long as they perform the duties of their offices faithfully and with adequate skill, abstaining from all active or offensive interference in politics, the reply is promptly made that there is no equality or fairness in the contests of made, that there is no equality or fairness in the contests of party, when one party claims to have a perfect light to all the offices, and actually enjoy them when in power, while the other will only let in their friends when some specific cause of removal can be shown sgainst incumbents of the adverse party. And, ar, its difficult to give a satisfactory answer to this proposition. The question is a serious one; how Senator from Maine at some length; but, at present, I shall detain the Senate only a very short time. I do not wish to say any thing upon the subject to-morrow, at which time I understand the vote is to be taken upon it. At this late hour of the day I shall present very briefly some of my views upon the questions at issue, in reply to some of the positions assumed by the Senator from Maine. Understanding the other day that the Senator from Maine intended to make Lo extended reply to the remarks offered by the Senator from Connecticut, and a very general wish having been expressed that this resolution should be pessed upon without further delay, I intimated my intention upon some future occasion, most probably when the resolution offered by the Senator from Indians (Mr. Whiteoms) came up for consideration, to present to the Senate my views at large upon the principles mainly involved in that resolution, and in the one now under consideration; and this is still my purpose. My design was chiefly to address myself to the question of the unlimited power of removal from office claimed for the Executive; a principle involved in the resolutions offered by the Senator from Indiana, and a principle that has been practised upon to some extent by the Senstor from Maine and the Senator from Indiana, and a principle that has been practised upon to some extent by both pelitical parties when in power, and one which has become an avowed and cardinal principle in the creed of the Democratic party.

My opinion with regard to the practice of removal from office, without other cause than difference of political sentiment, is, air, that Congress ought speedily and rigorously to regarlate the whole subject by law, and that if it is not thus party proscription ? It is for these reasons, sir, that I think he time has come when we should regulate this removing and appointing power by law. I repeat, if we do not regulate it by our laws, it will regulate us. It will control th operations of this Government, and in the end, I fear, lead to Mr. BRADBURY. I would inquire of the honorable Ser

ator, whether I understood one point of his remarks aright? Does the Senator assert, that no Administration can stand unless it adopt the system of proscription for opinion's sake Mr. Bell. I meant to express my fear that no party can long maintain its ground unless it adopts that practice. do not undertake to say how long the administration of General Taylor can stand, but I begin to have my doubts whether any party or administration that practices this limited use of public patronage, can sustain itself for any great length of

Mr. Bradburt. This is the point which I wish to come at. Am I to understand the Senator from Tennessee as wishing to convey the idea that this Administration have not removed individuals from office because of their political opinions, but for other causes; or that this Administration have adopted the practice of removing from office because o political opinions, for the purpose of obtaining friends?

Mr. Bell. I made no such insinuation as that present

in the latter inquiry of the Senator. I said the time had come when this question of the power of the President to practice same principles. And if the Senator were only authorized to able Senator has worked himself up to that conclusion. say that his party will not act upon that system hereafter, I should consider it one of the greatest reforms of the age—one of greater and more beneficent consequences to the country and the administration, so far, of General Taylor. Sir, there of greater and more beneficent consequences to the country than any adjustment which we are likely to make of the pending difficulties connected with another great question before Jackson came into office he found the office-holders all, or been directed by others, I could find only one or two where I considered the grounds of removal questionable. There may be a hundred such cases, for aught I know, but I know of taken or unjust allegations or charges. Only one or two such cases of questionable propriety have come to my knowledge; every other removal of which I have heard the cause has been just and proper. I hold, sir, officious intermeddling with elec-tions, as before stated—the drumming up at the polls, officiating at public meetings, becoming noisy partisans, the making of post offices places for the assemblage of political caucuses, and all other acts of excessive partisan zeal, sufficient causes for the expulsion of the off-inding parties. I hold all these things to be anti-republican in principle, and a just cause of removal. There may be other causes of removal bes. For, sir, it is well known that the doctrine of sides those I have specified—such as want of competent skill secratic party is that the President, in virtue of the and neglect of official duties. I do not undertake to enumerate them sil. And when I speak of the grounds upon which the Administration act in making removals, I ailude to removals from office within the exclusive and proper control of the President. This is what I meant to say. Now, sir, a word more with regard to these pledges of Gen.

Taylor, so often slluded to. I would here remark that I did not intend, when I first rose, to go into the discussion of this point; and I have only adverted to it now because when upon some future occasion, I come to speak upon this ques-tion, I desire to confine myself as much as possible to an examination of this doctrine of the unlimited power of removal, claimed to be vested in the Executive, what it leads to, and how it can be controlled and regulated. The Senator from Maine, besides referring to the letters in which Gen. Taylor disavows that proscriptive feeling and policy which he now ascribes to him, alluded to the sentiments contained in his In-augural Address, and charitably intimates his belief that Gen-Caylor meant, when he delivered that address, to be faithful to his pledges, and to honestly carry out the principles he then laid down : but that since that time he has been moved from his purpose. What said Gen. Taylor in that address? Why, that, so far as lay in his power, in the exercise of the appointing power, he would make honesty, capacity, and fidelity the test of official qualification; and the want of these qualifications he would regard as just cause of removal from office. Now, the Senator interprets that declaration to mean that, for no other cause than the want of these qualifications would he dismiss a public officer. I cannot but think, sir, that the Senator has allowed his feelings to mislead him greatly in his nferences from the language of the inaugural address of Gen. Taylor, when he assumes it as a pledge that he would not remove for any cause but the absence of these specific and essential qualifications in an office-holder. The Senator seems not to know that the pledge to remove for the want of these speci-fic qualifications, in its true interpretation, has reference to an evil which, in the past history of the Government, has been the source of great injury to the public service. It is, that the President for the time being has often failed to remove an office-holder notoriously deficient in the proper qualifications; at one period from an over-scrupulous delicacy in the exercise of the removing power, but much more frequently, at a later period, because the incumbent was his friend and partisan. Does the Senator know, or has he forgotten, that the act of 1820, which limited the term of all the most important civil officers of the Government to four years, was intended to remedy an abuse which had its origin in the extreme caution and forbearance of the Executive in the exercise of his just topics of party discussion, and I can hardly trust myself to speak That act, I have heard, was suggested by Mr. Crawpowers ? proper, yet it has proved to be most fatal in its consequences. The Senator from Alabama (Mr. Kiwe) appears to have been the only member of this body at the time who had the sagacity to foresee its results, and he voted against it. For a long period anterior to the passage of that act, the practice of removal from office, except in the most flagrant cases of peculation or corruption, had become obsolete; and such was the deference of the Executive to public sentiment, which then watched the exercise of the Executive prerogatives with the utmost jeal ousy, that some of the important offices in every part of the country were in the hands of negligent, imbecile, or otherwise inefficient and incompetent persons. It was supposed that a law limiting the term of office to four years would remedy this abuse, by leaving the President free to appoint a fit and ompetent successor at the end of every official term, in all cases of delinquency in the preceding incumbent, without subject

ing himself to the charge of tyranny and proscription.

That, sir, is the history of the act of 1820. The operation f it was beneficial in many respects until a period commence ing about ten years after its passage, when the interests of party interposed to prevent its operation, and to make it the source of increased abuses. Under the system of political and party proscription introduced in the practice of the Federal Government during the administration of Gen. Jackson, the act of 1820 has become nothing more than a convenient instrument to enable a party President to carry out the proscriptive policy under circumstances less obnexious to popular clamor. And the general result has been, that when an incumbent, however inefficient or negligent, happens to be the

of posed to the odious policy of proscription for opinion's sake; and this statement of Gov. Crittenden is triumphantly appealed to as proof conclusive, not only that General Taylor was pledged by his own letters and the language of his inaugural address against the policy of party proscription, but, when these pl dges are considered in connexion with the number of officers ac'ually removed by Gen. Taylor, that he has grossly violated them. Does not the Senator know that the distin-guished gentleman of Kentucky referred to, known as he was and is as the decided enemy of the proscriptive policy, when he was a member of this body, regarded the interference of office holders in elections as so gross an abuse that he intro duced and advocated the passage of a bill to prohibit it by law, and to compel the President to remove all such offenders against efficial propriety? And is it for a moment to be presumed that Gov. Crittenden ever dreamed of pledging that his friend Gen. Taylor would not remove for any such cause? But, aside from the authority of Gov. Crittenden on this subtime sgainst another party that openly avows as one of its ject, Gen. Taylor, in assuming officious intermeddling in electronic less of action, the exclusive appropriation of the spoils tions as good cause for removal, might well rely upon the doctrine of Mr. Jefferson, the boasted father of Democracy. That great man was opposed in principle to the practice of removal opinion's sake, yet he held all active interference in elections as just cause of removal. Gen. Taylor, then, has taken the ground that Jefferson took, and he may safely stand upon such a platform. I need not remind the Senator from Maine that the Democratic party at this day goes far beyond and con-trary to the doctrines of Jefferson upon this subject. Can the Senator from Maine really believe that Gen. Taylor, either in his numerous letters or in his inaugural address, really meant to pledge himself that he would not remove a public officer on the ground of intermeddling in elections? I cannot perceive even both parties should be restrained, or both practice upon the The Senator has instituted a comparison between the num

> is no fairness, no justice in such a parallel. that there were a few incumbents in the Executive depart-ments, and throughout the country, who had received their appointments under the administration of the elder Adams and of Gen. Washington, yet the mass of them had been put in office by Mr. Jefferson, by Madison, and Monroe, all democratic and republican in their principles. The practice of re-movals from office had fallen almost into disuse after the commencement of Mr. Jefferson's administration; and, with but few exceptions, the offices of the Government were filled by persons who held to the principles of the party which triumphed in 1800. Gen. Jackson, it is well known, did not make removals on the ground that the incumbents were Federalists, ut because they were anti-Jackson men.
>
> Mr. Bradburr. If the Senator will allow me, I stated

that I had reference to those who were in favor of, and those who were opposed to, Gen. Jackson.

Mr. Bell. The distinction between Democrats and Fedeprogress of removal he was probably turning out a Democrat.

rence to the question, whether they were Jackson men or anti-These forty removals, then, were made on the ground of anti-Jackson feelings and sentiments; what is the presumption that arises as to the political sentiments of the remainder of the three or four hundred effice-holders in Washington? Why, they must have been Jackson men; or, at all events, willing to be so considered. And Genera Jackson would not think of removing his own friends. Well, sir, see the contrast. There had been a fierce struggle for final ascendency between Mr. Adams and Gen. Jacksononly forty of the three or four hundred officers in the Executive Departments were understood to be friendly to the Administration of Mr. Adams. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky (Mr. CLAY) formed a part of his administration; and if any man ever had just cause to indulge proscriptive feelings, he might find it in the circumstances and incidents eelings, he might find it in the circumstances and of the contest then going on; but not a single removal of all the office-holders in Washington known to be favorable to Judge McLean, then Postmaster General, and the abiest we ever had, was known to favor the election of Gen. Jackson, still he was retained in office. But so soon as Gen. Jackson came into power, he proceeded to remove every office-holder in Washington and throughout the country who, in the pre-ceding canvass, had made himself obnoxious to him by declaring his opposition to him. The whole number re-moved under his Administration and that of Mr. Van Buren is said to have been about twelve hundred, and at the close of Mr. Van Buren's administration it may be fairly presumed that they were all, or nearly all Jackson men or Democrats. But what was the condition of things when Gen. Taylor came into power? How many Whigs or Taylor men were then in office of the twenty thousand civil officers or employes under the Government subject to Executive control

robably not five hundred, if so many.

But am dwelling too long on this subject. The question presented by the manner in which the discretionary power of re-noval claimed to be in the President has been exercised, and the The Senator from Maine has adverted to a doctrine admoval claimed to be in the President has been exercised, and the consequences to the country, bring to my mind old and tamiliar of them without unnecessary digression. It has been my pur-pose, in the suggestions I have made, to show that General Taylor's course since he came into power is susceptible of the clearest and most ample defence and vindication against all the tor from Maine, in the views he has presented of the course

candidate for the Presidency, members of both parties, Whige and Democrats, united in the expression of their desire to see him elevated to the highest honor in the gift of the people. He was solicited to become a candidate by public meetings, held without distinction of party, and in some instances by meetings exclusively Democratic. Though a Whig, it was

the friend and partition of the Executive, he is responited; and, ye are the other hand, however faithful and competent me to get perfect the property and the second the place. But which he would for a mas in Gen. Typic the second the place of Executive and the second the place of Executive and the competent of the first position to desire to be develed to the Presidence of the Second the place of Executive and the competent of the first position to desire to be develed to the Presidence of the place of Executive and the place o

pointed to the fact that no Whig platform was laid down by souri (Mr. Benton) may recollect his came. I believe it was the Philadelphia Convention. And why was it not laid down? Carson. (Mr. BENTON assented.) The argument upon It is a sufficient reason to say that the Convention did not which the call was resisted by the Jackson members in the consider that General Taylor would regard their authority to general debate which took place upon that and Mr. Holmes's prescribe his curse upon any subject; they did not consider that they had the man before them who would submit to party discretionary in the President by the constitution; that he discretionary in the President by the constitution; that he alone was responsible; that the Senate had no right to deconsider that be ever was a party candidate, in the sense in which those terms are understood throughout the country, or power and control; that the Senate had no other power in that he is even how a party President, though elected by the Whig party; though I seldom see or converse with him upon such subjects. And give me leave to say, Mr. President, that nominated. But Mr. Barton, in the case of Carson, took any man, of any solid pretensions to distinction, lets himself down very much when he professes his willingness to subscribe to whatever doctrine or policy any number of his friends may think proper to lay down for his guidance. I believe the practice of the Democratic party is that their candidate shall a cause of some sort derogatory to the character of the dissquare himself by the rules laid down by the Convention which nominate him, and that this requisition is rigorously onsent to. Heresolutely, and to the last, refused to pledge himself to any particular system of Administrative policy.

After all that has been said against General Taylor by the Senator from Maine—after all the abuse which has been lavished upon him by the Democratic journals—after all that has been said agains the Whig party, for taking up and electing removals from office during the administration of General him to the Presilency, will that Senator deny that the Democratic party seriously contemplated his nomination, and that it was probably only not done because General Taylor Mr. BRIGHT, in his seat. He was the last man we would

have thought of taking up.

Mr. Bell. Nevertheless it was so announced by the prin cipal organ of the party, the Washington Union, and if such so regarded, when, as far as I recollect, every such call has thing was never thought of by the Democratic party, theu

their organ is not a reliable sheet.

Mr. Bradbury. I think the Senator must be mistaken. Mr. Bell. I think I cannot be mistaken. I certainly have seen the statement in the Union that Gen. Taylor would probably have received the nomination of the democratic party but for his declaration that he was a Whig. Will the Senator deny that after Gen. Taylor received the nomination of catic party upon this subject during the last twenty years.

I did not intend when I rose to occupy the time of the Senate two or three hundred democratic journals of the country, that future occasion I would ask the a tention of the Senate upon General Taylor had become a party candidate; that he was the general principles involved in the resolutions, and it is the Whig candidate; that he would be proscriptive in his policy if elected; that all his professions of moderation meant nothing at all? And if this be so, how could the people have been deceived by General Taylor's professions? Was the honorable Senator deceived ?

deceive me, although there are many that they did deceive. Mr. Bell. Well, I will not press that point. But I will say that General Taylor lost more Whig votes than we gained on the Democratic side in consequence of his not being conidered a thorough party candidate. Mr. SEWARD. At least forty to one in the State of New

Mr. BELL. The Senator from New York says "forty t one" in that State; and I have little doubt that in every State ralists was peither made nor regarded; at every step in his of the Union General Taylor lost as many Whig votes as hi gained Democratic ones. But will my friend from Maine The Senator from Maine, as an evidence of the greater forbearance of Gen. Jackson in making removals, states that of
the three or four hundred office-holders then in the Executive
Departments, he only removed forty; and he now admits, as
not desire that Genral Taylor should be proscriptive in his
he did in his speech, that these removals were made in refe-Mr. BRABBURT. That would be a reflection upon the

persons removed in my own State. The gentlemen who have been turned out were known to be men of honesty, capacity, and fidelity, and I regretted to see them turned out.

Mr. Butt. But I desire to know whether the honorable Senator, and his leading friends of the Democratic party, would not have been greatly disappointed if General Taylor had failed to make removals of Democrats from office ? Mr. BRADBURY. I have never given any thought to that

Mr. Bell. I will not press my friend upon that point. It is a delicate subject, and I have no right to expect an answer. Will the honorable Senator deny that the Democrats, of whom he speaks as having been turned out of office in his own State had been active intermeddlers in elections? I believe, from the general practice of the Democratic administrations in the last twenty years, of putting into office those who were expected to be most serviceable in elections, that Gen. Taylor might with perfect safety, and in accordance with his principles, have turned out every office-holder in the Northern States. They had been put in by the Democratic party, and were ex officio active partisans. So far was this policy of requiring the active service of office-holders carried during Gen. Jackson's administration, that I remember a case in Ohio in which one Jackson postmaster was turned out and another put in, on the express ground that he was a better Jackson man and more influential in elections than his predecessor. And I repeat that General Taylor might, with little risk of violating his principles, have turned out the whole corps of officeholders North; not so in the South and Southwest. In those sections office-holders are not so uniformly active partisans. In one of the most populous counties of Tennessee there is a Democratic postmaster, for example, who cannot be removed upon the principle adopted by the present Administration, Whigs who hold that the principle upon which removals are made should be the same in both parties, think it

vanced by Jefferson as republican-the equalization of the public offices between the two parties-one which the present Administration may consider sound; and insists that it has not been regarded in the removals made by General Taylor. The State of Tennessee has been referred to by the Senator among others as evidence of the truth of this allegation. I should charges of inconsistency and violated pledges which have been like to know who it was that gave the Senator the informa-made against him. I think, upon the whole, that the Sena-tion he relies upon in regard to removals in that State. Mr. BRADBURY. It was a member of Congress from that

and practice of Gen. Taylor in the matter of pledges and removals from office, has been prompted by the arder of his feelin s to assail him with undue harshness, and at the same time rashly. I do not, I repeat, pretend that Gen. Taylor may not have made some mistakes both in his removals and appointments—that he he has not in some instances been instances been instances. It was a member of Congress from that State. No matter, I am not disposed to question the general correctness of the statement. Most of the important offices in that State have been changed—some upon removals and others upon resignation and the expirations of the official terms; but I know that some five or six offices held by Demomisled as to the existence of proper cause of removal; and in crats, and ranging in value, I should estimate, from some four others that he has put incompetent or unworthy persons in bundred to eight hundred or a thousand dollars, are still in office. Indeed, I know of one instance in which I am appreoffice. Indeed, I know of one instance in which I am apprehensive that I misled him in regard to an appointment, in which I took a particular interest, but I was myself misled by others; and there may be many other cases of the same kind.

But the Senator from Maine has assailed the consistency of General Taylor upon another point, in regard to which I think he does him injustice. He takes up and comments with severity upon Gen. Taylor's repeated declaration that he would not be a party candidate. It will not be denied by the Senator that when General Taylor was first spoken of as a candidate for the Presidency, members of both parties, Whise

Mr. Coopen. No, sir.

Mr. Coopen. No, sir. Mr. Dawson, in his seat. Take the State of Moine ! Mr. Batt. I will sak my friend from Maine whether in is own State he knew of any Whig who held an office of any value when General Taylor came into the postession of the

missed functionary; that to dismiss a public officer and refuse to communicate the cause, was to inflict an injury and do gross injustice to private character. It was an injury to his family and his means of livelihood. If the party removed was innocent of any misconduct, common justice required that his innocence should appear; if guilty of any misd Jackson were justified under the pretext of reform, which necessarily increased the presumption of delinquency of some kind on the part of the dismissed officer. But Mr. Barton's resolution was laid on the table by a strict party vote. Now if any thing can be regarded as settled by the Democratic party, it seems to me that this question of the right of the Senate to call for the causes of removals from office must be been rejected by that party when in power in the last twenty

Mr. Dawson. On every occasion since 1789 they have

resisted these inquiries.

Mr. BRADBURY. The Senator is mistaken. Mr. BELL. I am not prepared to go so far back as that, but I think I am not mistaken as to the course of the Demomy intention, if no Senator anticipates me, to offer for the consideration of the Senate a proposition to restrict the discretionary power claimed by the Executive over all the civil officers of the country, and to regulate removals from office by law, and I am glad to find that the Senator from Maine, Mr. Bradburr. I will say that the declarations did not if I understood him, is ready to co-operate with me on that

Mr. BRIGHT. It was not my intention to have said a word on this subject, but the remarks of the honorable Senator from Tennessee have struck me with so much surprise, and differ so widely from what I regard as the facts in that I feel compelled (late as it is) to ask the indulgence of the Senate for a few moments, while I attempt a short reply to one or two of his positions.

The Senator must have doubtless proceeded at some length

with his remarks before I entered the chamber, and I am not quite sure that I understand the tenor of those I have heard. I misquote him, however, I hope he will please to correct me. I understood the honorable Senator to say that the present Executive had not, since his induction into office, violated any oledge or pledges given to the country before his election, in Mr. BELL. I said so, according to any thing that I had a

ersonal knowledge of in my own section of the country; and believe, unless he has been misled, he has done it nowhere. sponse of the honorable Senator a general or special interpre-tation. I presume he means by "his own section," the State of Tennessee. If so, I have no right, and do not, after his atement, contradict him; but if the honorable Senator would have his declaration general, or broad enough to embrace the State I have the honor to represent, then I take issue with him. Sir, I here declare publicly, upon my responsibility as a Senator, that the indiscriminate removals, made at the time and under the circumstances attending them, amount, in my and repeated pledges given by the present Executive to the public, without which pledges, in my opinion, he could not have been elected. What a spectacle is here presented—one that, as an American, I will not characterize as it deserves : respect, for the nation, and respect for that high office filled by e incumbent, restrains a full expression of my sentiments That pledges were given, none are so bold to deny; now let us see how they were kept in my State, Indiana. There are some twenty or more Federal officers in that State, subject to the approval of this body; of these, one alone remains a monuent of Executive forbearance-an Executive that c mmended itself to the people for their suffrages on the ground that he "lathed proscription." Besides these, there are a hundred or more (whose names do not come here for confirmation) other mementoes of the manner in which pledges made before an election are afterwards redeemed. Mr. Bell. Do you mean this generally

Mr. BRIGHT. I am now speaking of the conduct he Executive as applicable to my own State.

SEVERAL SENATORS. It is alike applicable to ours. Mr. BRIGHT. I understood the honorable Senator from ennessee to say that the files of the several Departments would show that for all cases of removals there had been a cause. If so, it becomes a matter of serious interest to those who appreciate the value of an unsulli d reputation, and who prize fair fame far above office or its emoluments, (as many do, and as I trust every man does,) to know what the causes are that have been alleged against them, and upon which the Executive grounded is action. It belongs to every man to have the offences with which he stands charged rend out, that a isinterested public may decide for itself on the guilt or innocence of a fellow-citizen, and not that a corps of interested officials should pronounce a star chamber sentence. In the absence of the charges upon which Executive action was founded, the Executive itself stands forth as the public accuser and the removed as the criminals. Is it not then due to this Administration that it should clear itself of the fearful te- on this subject; and in my part of the country I know of no sponsibility of this wholesale denunciation of thousands of case of removal affording any just ground to impute deception our fellow-citizens? Does the honorable Senator (who seems or fraud on the public, and I do not think that there has been or fraud on the public, and I do not think that there has been sponsibility of this wholesale denunciation of thousands of to speak with a full knowledge of the acts and doings of the present Administration) know of instances in which false in the removals in my State, or where there have been applicharges have been filed against incumbents by persons who sought their removal that they might themselves occupy their places, and who have actually succeeded in their efforts?

Mr. Brut. I do not—and if any man has done so, and the person almost a succeeded in their efforts of the person almost a succeeded in their efforts. btained office by such means, I would instantly seek his re-

done, knowingly, I should myself be disposed to denounce the Executive as false to his pledges and the country. Mr. Baisar. With this avoxal from the honorable Senator, I come now to the point in controversy, and the im- in the proper department, yet my opinion was overruled portant point involved in the resolutions offered by the Sena- and the removals were n t made. tor fr. m Maine. I say there are cases (and I speak know-

No doubt, in many instances, it will be found that charges have been preferred, but in few or none can they be proved when tested. As one of the friends of the late Administration, and as the friend of all who were its friends, I court investigation. My faith in the general purity of the party which has built up the institutions of our country is firm, and I believe, when put to the test, its efficers will come out of any ordeal that may be instituted with unsulfied reputations. I have, sir, in my mind at this moment a case furnishing an unanswerable argument in favor of the adoption of these resolutions. It is that of a most worthy and meritorious man, whose appointment to a very responsible office was advised solutions. It is that of a most worthy and meritorious man, whose appointment to a very responsible office was advised and consented to by this body some three years ago, and who has been removed by the present Administration on a set of exparte charges, preferred and acted upon without the knowledge of the accused, and which charges if true would subject him to severe punishment. I should not have referred to this particular case, were it not in my power, from my own personal knowledge of the facts, to enter an unqualified denial as to their truth, and publicly court and defy investigation. Take the offices, but in doing so travel some other track than over the reputation of the faithful and strick n down Democratic incumbents. This and like cases (of which no doubt umbents. This and like cases (of which no doubt there are many) demand the acruinty of this hody. It is due alike to curselves and our fellow-citizens that the door be thrown wide open, and their accusers be invited to enter.

Mr. Bell. Will the honorable Senator tell me whether

he has applied in any quarter for information in the case to which he has alluded.

Mr. Barour. I am gratified that the honorable Senator has asked me the question. I answer, that the chairman of a committee of this body, whose duties connect him with that department of the Government having charge of the papers I refer to, made a written request in behalf of the committee, and the reply was: "He regarded the papers applied for as exclusively within the direction and control of the President."

Thus making it very evident that unless some action is had have exclusively as the support of all the information. sere, requiring an official surrender of all the information

sought by these resolutions, many of us will be left to act in the dark, and our friends be condemned on false charges, without even the forms of a trial. Mr. BELL. What I denied was that it was true, that

Gen. Taylor had made false pretences. The Senator from Indiana and the Senator Maine say he has. I have been arguing that, from the facts and statements relied on by the Senator from Maine, this charge has not been made out. What I said was, that Gen. Taylor did not mean to say, nor that makes an issue between us, as to whether it is so or not that Gen. Taylor has made false pretences—professing one thing and doing another. Now, the Senator from Indiana thinks he has, and so thinks the Senator from Maine. But when they come to bring forward the proofs and the argu-ments, it appears that these charges of false pretences and broken pledges are inferred from the general declaration that he was opposed to the proscriptive policy, and that he would not remove except for cause. But for what cause? Cause, that would subject the party removed to the penalties of law? Incompetency? Are these the only causes that should be understood as governing Gen. Taylor in these removals according to his declarations? By no means. There may be many causes besides, such as the neglect of the duries of office and intermeddling with elections. Private habits, too, are sometimes a good cause of removal, such as a too free indulgence at the festive board. Now these are causes which sometimes may constitute a sufficient ground of removal, and yet it would be cruel and brutal in the Administration to make such matters a subject of public investigation or of public exposure. These causes may not involve criminality in the eye of the law, while it cannot be denied that they interfere with the proper discharge of public duties. Besides, young men may reform, and old ones too. Now, in reference to the grounds upon which removals have been made in Indiana, or to the cause of removal in the particular case referred to by the Sena or from that State, I know nothing. My information upon the whole subject of the number of the removals that have been made, and the causes of removal, is of a very gen-eral nature. My friend over the way, (Mr. Buancar,) and eral nature. My friend over the way, (Mr. Buanden,) and my triend from Connecticut, (Mr. Saith,) have been very industrious in collecting all the statistics upon the subject, and I must say that I have not much faith in them, though they may be very correct; I mean to say, that I do not know personally much in detail of what the Administration have been doing. I have, it is true, some knowledge of the character of the gentlemen who fill the highest offices, and I think them honest. I may say, also, that I have had but a limited personal acquaintance with Gen. Taylor, but I think he is an sonal acquaintance with Gen. Taylor; but I think he is an honest man, and that he intends to execute the power confidd to him justly, whenever that power is brought into exercise; and I think I can also undertake to say, that whenever such a case as that suggested by the Senator from Indiana is made clear, he will see that justice is done; nay, more; when it is discovered that any man has practised fraud upon any department of the Government, with the view of securing office for himselt, he will, on the fraud being made infinitest, be imme-diately removed. I shall be wholly mistaken in Gen. Taylor's character if he does not render prompt and decided justice in such a case. If he should not do so, I should prepared to renounce and denounce him myself. I do not undertake to deny or impugn the statement of the Senator fram Indiana, and I repeat, that if such a wrong as that mentioned by the Senator from Indiana has been perpetuated, it ought to be redressed promptly. After all, I would ask whether this is the proper place f r such inquisitions to be made? I do think that where there is probable ground to believe that such an abuse has existed, and that there is no disposition shown to correct it, then there is cause for an inquiry of a more serious character. If the honorable Senator says that, from his personal knowledge, he knows these charges to be false, and that the man is suffering in his character, I will say it is a most gross and outrageous case, and has only to be made sufficientevident to meet with the most satisfactory correct n. Mr. BRADBURY. I would like to inquire of the Semator from Tennessee, whether the heads of departments have not made removals from office on account of pointing opinion?

Mr. Bell. I have not seen the heads of departments, or had any communication with them upon this subject for a con-siderable time. What principles they proceed upon in makng removals from offices within their control, I cannot state. I will state all that I know upon the subject. I profess to have understood Gen. Taylor's principles, and professions upobtained office by such means, I would instantly seek his removal. I venture, however, that there is not a case of that sort in existence. If it is shown that such a thing has been where no such cause was shown, there has been no removal. There were, however, two instances which came under my knowledge of cause assigned which I regarded as sufficiently established, and gave my opinion to that effect, to be file

There are twin sisters residing near Keyport (N. J.) who ingly) where honest, upright, just men, faithful officers, of unspotted integrity, have been removed on false charges— have entered their hinety-second year.